

REMARKS

Claims 1 is the only claim pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the line filter is disposed upstream to the filter with respect to the traction surfaces." Support for this Amendment can be found on page 19, line 3 and page 24, line 12 in the specification, and in Figs. 1 and 2.

Claim 1 is rejected as being unpatentable over at least Yamamoto (USP 6,203, 467) or Imanishi (USP 6,746,364) in view of Bauer et al. (USP 5,382, 099). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that 1) it was notoriously known in the art to provide a line filter in a transmission for filtering the transmission oil, and that 2) with respect to making the bearing filter a rougher mesh than the line filter, ... it has been obvious to one in the art ... to adjust the size of the line filters ... to provide a specific quality to fluid being supplied throughout the transmission. Further, the Examiner asserts that adjusting the relative mesh size of the line filters so the line filter is a finer mesh than the bearing filter would have been within the skill of one in the art to trap a specific size of wear particles that may be introduced into the oil passages after the line filter thereby ensuring a specific quality of oil to the bearing.

However, in order to achieve the purpose of "ensuring a specific quality of oil to the bearing", a finer filter would have to be disposed on the downstream side with respect to the traction surfaces. In contrast, the claimed invention requires that the finer line filter be disposed *upstream* of the filter with respect to the traction surfaces: The mesh filters are disposed at exit sides of the oil passage to remove the dusts between the line filter and the exits. See page 22, lines 13-17 in the specification.

Accordingly, the Examiner's suggested motivation to combine the references is not consistent with the claimed feature. One of the ordinary skill in the art would not have provided

the line filter upstream of the filter, following the Examiner's suggested motivation. Hence, it is submitted that the Examiner has failed to provide a logical rationale for modifying teachings in the references to arrive at the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian W. Hannon/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

Date: January 11, 2008